

REMARKS

I. Status of Application

By the present Amendment, claim 17 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-16 and 18 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-18 presently stand rejected.

II. Formalities

The Examiner has acknowledged Applicant's claim to foreign priority and has indicated receipt of the certified copies of the Priority Documents.

The Examiner has returned the initialed Form PTO/SB/08 filed with the Information Disclosure Statement ("IDS") on June 12, 2007, indicating that the references cited therein have been considered. However, the Examiner did not return the initialed Form PTO/SB/08 included with the IDS filed April 4, 2005 (although the Examiner has indicated that the references cited therein have been considered). Applicant respectfully requests that the properly initialed Form PTO/SB/08 included with the IDS filed April 4, 2005.

The Examiner has indicated that the drawing figures filed on April 4, 2005 have been accepted.

III. Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the abstract of the disclosure alleging that it contains numbers referencing the drawings. Applicant has replaced the abstract of the disclosure with a new abstract, as set forth above. Therefore, the Examiner's objections to the abstract of the disclosure are now moot.

IV. Claim Objections

Claim 6 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 1.75(c) as allegedly being in improper form.

Claim 6 has been amended, as set forth above. Thus, the Examiner's objections with respect to claim 6 are now moot.

Claims 5, 11 and 15 are objected to because of alleged informalities. Applicant submits that the Examiner's objections to claim 5 have been rendered moot by virtue of the amendments to claim 1, as set forth above. Further, claims 11 and 15 have been amended, as set forth above, to address the informalities noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these objections.

V. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Odai (JP 2000-043243 A). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

As an initial matter, Applicant notes that claim 17 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and, therefore, the Examiner's rejection with respect to claim 17 is now moot.

A. Independent Claim 1

Moreover, without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 1, as set forth above, to recite (among other things):

...wherein the conductive portion is formed in at least one of a sheet feed roller and an idle roller that carries the printing sheet;

wherein the sheet feed roller or the idle roller is formed by coating a predetermined insulating coating on a surface of a conductive rod-shaped member; and

wherein the conductive portion is formed by stripping off a part of the coating on the sheet feed roller or the idle roller.

Odai nowhere discloses or suggests these features and, therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Odai for *at least* these reasons.

For instance, the grounds of rejection allege that element 14 of Odai corresponds to the claimed conductive portion and that element 12 corresponds to the claimed sheet feed roller. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the grounds of rejection. Odai discloses that element 14 references conductive rubber (*see e.g.*, paragraph 0015). Odai further discloses that element 12 references an earth roller for missing the electric charge of the electrified ink mist 311 (*see e.g.*, paragraph 0015). Odai fails to disclose or suggest that the conductive rubber 14 is formed by stripping off a part of the coating on the earth roller 12, as required by claim 1. Quite to the contrary, Odai discloses that the conductive rubber 14 is twisted around the surroundings of the metallic rodding 14.

Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Odai for *at least* these reasons. Further, the dependent claims 3, 5, 8, 11 and 12 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

B. Independent Claim 15

In view of the similarity between the recitations of claim 15 and the recitations discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that reasons analogous to those presented above regarding claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claim 15. Further, the dependent claim 18 is patentable *at least* by virtue of its dependency on claim 15. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

VI. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Odai (JP 2000-043243 A) in view of Kakumori (JP 10-081008 A). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Odai (JP 2000-043243) in view of Kawaguchi et al. (2003/0030712 A1). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Odai (JP 2000-043243) in view of Kishi et al. (5,623,295). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Odai (JP 2000-043243) in view of Sasaki et al. (2001/0038411 A1). Claims 13, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Odai (JP 2000-043243) in view of Otsuki et al. (EP 1193072 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

The dependent claims 4, 6-7, 9-10, 13-14 and 16 incorporate all the novel and nonobvious recitations of their respective base claims 1 and 15. For *at least* the reasons already discussed above, Odai fails to teach or suggest all the recitations of claims 1 and 15. Further, the cited references fail to remedy the deficient teachings of Odai. Therefore, the dependent claims 4, 6-7, 9-10, 13-14 and 16 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 10/530,174

Attorney Docket No.: Q87222

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 16, 2008

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666